

One of the purposes of the act was to "Diminish [] the influence of special-interest money...." ARS 16-940 –

**Question:** What is the purpose of the Citizens Clean Elections Campaign Act?

**Answer:** By encouraging broad-reaching citizen participation in the political process and eliminating special-interest monies in campaigns, the Act levels the playing field for qualified candidates by providing limited and equal funding, and enables registered voters to support their preferred candidates through affordable contributions and grass-roots support. Also, the Act allows candidates to focus their campaigns on the issues in the best interest of Arizonans, not funding.

**3 general purposes of the CCEC:**

- Eliminate special-interest money
- Level the playing field
- Provide limited and equal funding

RECEIVED

MAR 22 2006

CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS  
COMMISSION

Proposed changes regarding airplane travel creates a process that is totally contrary to these three general purposes.

**EXAMPLE: Airplane travel from Falcon field in Mesa, AZ to Sierra Vista, AZ**

**Example #1 –Candidate A – Participating Candidate**

Candidate A is a Participating Candidate

Candidate A has campaign speech in Sierra Vista and decides to fly.

Candidate A will spend 3 hours on the ground campaigning/traveling while in Sierra Vista

Candidate A does not own a plane

Candidate A doesn't have friends who own a plane.

Candidate A must charter a plane and contacts Falcon Executive Aviation for the flight.

**Option #1 – Beechcraft Baron**

- Not pressurized, no A/C, 3 passengers only, can't fly with weather problems.
- Nautical Distance: 133 miles one way (266 round trip)
- Roundtrip Fare: \$625
- Holding Fee: \$45/hour X 3 hours = \$135
- Total Cost of Trip: \$760
- Cost per Nautical Mile: \$2.86 (\$760/266 miles)

**Option #2 – BEECH King Air**

- Pressurized, A/C, 7 passengers, weather not an issue
- Nautical Distance: 133 miles one way (266 round trip)
- Roundtrip Fare: \$1,200
- Holding Fee: : \$45/hour X 3 hours = \$135
- Total Cost of Trip: \$1,335
- Cost per Nautical Mile: \$5.02 (\$1335/266 miles)

PUBLIC COMMENT  
FROM MIKE BREWER  
FOR AGENDA ITEM V (B)

**Example # 2 – Candidate B – Non Participating Candidate**

Candidate B is a NonParticipating Candidate

Candidate B has campaign speech in Sierra Vista and decides to fly.

Candidate B will spend 3 hours on the ground campaigning/traveling while in Sierra Vista

Candidate B owns a plane or has a good friend who will fly him/her

**Option #1 – Fly own plane or friend fly's the candidate**

- Nautical Distance: 133 miles one way (266 round trip)
- Roundtrip Fare: Irrelevant
- Holding Fee: Irrelevant
  
- Total Cost of Trip: \$263 (266 miles \* .99/mile)
- Cost per Nautical Mile: \$.99 (\$1335/266 miles)

Under this example, the participating candidate incurs a cost of \$1,335 (who has limited funds) and the nonparticipating candidate incurs a cost of \$263 – a difference of \$1,072

Here, clean elections would be REWARDING the use of special-interests for airplane travel and subsidizing their campaign costs while PENALIZING a clean election candidate by requiring the candidate to actually pay the market value of similar airplane travel.

This certainly does not level the playing field, if anything, it rewards nonparticipating candidates, allows special-interest to "offer to fly the candidate" while not requiring the candidate to pay the true costs and creates an inequity of funding.

PUBLICCOMMENT  
FROM MIKE BREWER  
FOR AGENDA ITEM V (B)